

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/629,472	0/629,472 07/29/2003		Hideyuki Suzuki	4041K-000142	7304
27572	7590	07/07/2004	EXAMINER		
HARNESS	, DICKE	Y & PIERCE, P.L.	TRAN, LEN		
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2200		o,		1725	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	A N N	A P 4/ x					
- -	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Symmony	10/629,472	SUZUKI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Len Tran	1725					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to c, cause the application to become ABANDONED	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ju	<u>uly 2003</u> .						
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This	action is non-final.						
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 is/are withdrawn from 5. Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>							
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	,					
10) $\square$ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 <i>July</i> 2003</u> is/are: a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		` '					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	taminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Applicationity documents have been received a (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)	_						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/03.		atent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 1725

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-3, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 164, subclass 312.
  - II. Claim 4, drawn to a method, classified in class 164, subclass 113.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to make plastic article.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Keith Miller on June 15, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-3. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claim 4 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1725

Page 3

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flemings et al (US 6,250,365).

As to claim 1, Flemings et al disclose a mold comprising a fixed mold (32) and a moveable mold (30) (fixed and movable mold as shown in conventional die in figure 1, wherein movable mold is on top moving along the rods) defining a cavity (26), when both molds are closed together, to be filled with molten metal, wherein the fixed mold (32) is provided with heating means (34) and the moveable mold is provided with cooling means (col. 2, line 66 to col.

Art Unit: 1725

3, lines 1-2), both of which are controlled by temperature control means, wherein the temperature variations in one cycle of the fixed and moveable sections are capable of individually controlled.

As to claim 3, the temperature control means is capable of controlling from 300 to 700 degrees C in the fixed mold, and also capable of controlling from solidifying to 0 degrees C in the movable mold (col. 3, lines 2-15).

8. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakano (US 4,798,237).

As to claim 1, Nakano discloses a mold comprising a fixed mold (a2) and a moveable mold (a1) defining a cavity, when both molds are closed together, to be filled with molten metal, wherein the fixed mold (a2) is provided with heating means (5') and the moveable mold is provided with cooling means (1)(col. 4, lines 37-44), both of which are controlled by temperature control means, wherein the temperature variations in one cycle of the fixed and moveable sections are capable of individually controlled.

As to claim 3, the temperature control means is capable of controlling from 300 to 700 degrees C in the fixed mold, and also capable of controlling from solidifying to 0 degrees C in the movable mold (col. 5 lines 57-64).

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/629,472

Art Unit: 1725

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano (US '237) or Flemings et al (US '365) as applied to claim 1 above in paragraph 7 and 8, and further in view of Yamaguchi et al (US 6,460,596).

Both Flemings et al and Nakano disclose a fixed mold section is disposed on the injection side and the claimed invention above, but fail to teach ejector pins from the moveable section.

However, Yamaguchi et al disclose an ejector pin (15) on the moveable section (10) for the purpose of removing the product (cast article) upon solidification (col. 6, lines 6-9).

Art Unit: 1725

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide ejector pins on the moveable section as taught by Yamaguchi et al, in Flemings et al and Nakano in order to release the cast product after solidification.

## Citation of Relevant Prior Arts

Koch (US 4,986,335) and Sauers (US 3,959,433) are cited as pertinent prior arts.

### Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Len Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1184. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1725

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Len Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 1725 6/4/04

LT

June 29, 2004